

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS FO Box 1430 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.tepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/635,473	08/07/2003	Alejandro Wiechers	200207445-1	1048	
22879 HEWLETT PA	7590 08/28/200 ACKARD COMPANY	EXAM	EXAMINER		
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400			DANNEM	DANNEMAN, PAUL	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3627		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			08/28/2008	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM mkraft@hp.com ipa.mail@hp.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Ī	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/635,473	WIECHERS, ALEJANDRO				
	Examiner	Art Unit				
	PAUL DANNEMAN	3627				

	PAUL DANNEMAN	3627					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 30 June 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
 X The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: 	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request				
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection, b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later, no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.							
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date whave been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of exhaust of the filled proposes of the serving the period to the set for the propose of the serving the serv	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.13 ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as				
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complifiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with the property of Appeal has been filed. 	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the					
AMENDMENTS							
The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	E below);					
 (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or 	ter form for appeal by materially rec	lucing or simplifying th	ne issues for				
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reje	cted claims.					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	od Con attacked bladen of blan Con		OTOL 204)				
 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 		ripliant Amendment (i	-10L-324).				
Application (s). Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		imely filed amendmer	t canceling the				
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		be entered and an ex	planation of				
Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:							
Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	l and/or appellant fails e 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	s to provide a				
 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 	n of the status of the claims after er	try is below or attache	ed.				
The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u>	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:				
 12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (13. ☐ Other: 	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).						
is. [] Oulei							
/F. Ryan Zeender/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3627							

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06)

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments have been thoroughly considered, but are not persuasive. Applicant argues that an "omnibus approach" to rejecting Claim 1 was taken. The Examiner has carefully reviewed the rejection, MPEP 707.07(d) and 706.07 and maintains that the rejection is in compliance. Applicant further argues that Laverty does not disclose creating a file "at the designer location", but instead is providing data to another so that they may create the file. Claim 1 clearly states a method of "performing automated shipping in a commercial printing environment including a designer location and a print service provider location, said method comprising:....", clearly this claim refers to multiple locations where the work is being performed, therefore the rejection is proper.